



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

John D. Taylor
Steve K. Taylor
Taylor Corp: Pre-Paid Cash Cards Unlimited
2204 Stephens St.
Vernon TX 76384

COPY MAILED

DEC 14 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Taylor, et al. : DECISION ON PETITION
Application No. 09/973,626 :
For: January 10, 2002 :
For: TAYLOR CORP.PRE-PAID CASH :
CARDS UNLIMITED :

This is a decision on the petition renewed under 37 CFR 1.137(a), September 19, 2007, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)." This is not a final agency decision.

This application became abandoned May 17, 2003 for failure to timely submit a proper reply to the non-final Office mailed January 16, 2003. A one month extension of time was timely procured. Notice of Abandonment was mailed August 9, 2005. A letter concerning the abandonment was filed September 1, 2005.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(1); (3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c).

The instant petition fails to satisfy requirement (3) set forth above.

Petitioners have failed to present a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable.

The Office may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding Office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been "unavoidable." See, 37 CFR 1.137(a)(3). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable. *Ex parte Pratt*, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887) (the term "unavoidable" "is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business"); *In re Mattullath*, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (D.C. Cir. 1912); *Ex parte Henrich*, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm'r Pat. 1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." *Smith v. Mossinghoff*, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). A petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay. *Haines v. Quigg*, 673 F. Supp. 314, 5 USPQ2d 1130 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

Petitioners attribute the failure to timely submit a proper reply to the non-final Office communication to medical illness, miscommunication with between applicants and the examiner of record, as well as misunderstanding of patent law, rules, and procedure.

Petitioners have failed to establish that the entire delay in timely submission of a proper reply to the non-final Office action was unavoidable.

To the extent petitioners attribute the delay to medical illness, it is noted that no corroborating documentation has been submitted in this regard. Furthermore, the medical illness is attributed to John David Taylor. Petitioners have failed to establish that the other joint inventor was unavoidably delayed in timely submitting a proper reply to the non-final Office action.

To the extent that petitioners attribute the delay to miscommunication between applicants and the examiner of record, petitioners are advised that applicants' reliance upon oral advice from USPTO employees is not unavoidable with the meaning of 37 CFR 1.137(a). See, *In re Sivertz*, 227 USPQ 255 at 256 (Comm'r Pat. 1985).

To the extent that petitioners attribute the delay to misunderstanding of patent law, rules, and procedure, petitioners are advised that delay resulting from the lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP, however, does not constitute "unavoidable" delay. See, *Haines v. Quigg*, 673 F. Supp. 314 at 317, 5 USPQ2d at 1132; *Vincent v. Mossinghoff*, 230 USPQ 621, 624 (D.D.C. 1985); *Smith v. Diamond*, 209 USPQ 1091 (D.D.C. 1981); *Potter v. Dann*, 201 USPQ 574 (D.D.C. 1978); *Ex parte Murray*, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 130, 131 (1891).

Any renewed petition must establish that the entire period of time from the time that a reply to the non-final Office action was due until the filing of a grantable petition was unavoidable.

ALTERNATE VENUE

Petitioners are strongly urged to consider filing a petition stating that the entire delay was unintentional. Petitioner's attention is directed to 37 CFR 1.137(b) which provides for the revival of an "unintentionally" abandoned application without a showing that the delay in prosecution or in late payment of an issue fee was "unavoidable". An "unintentional" petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by the required petition fee and reply.

The filing of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b). A form for this purpose was previously provided.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:

Mail Stop Petition
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By facsimile: (571) 273-8300

By hand: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window
Mail Stop Petition
Randolph Building
Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3205.

Alesia M. Brown
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions

Enclosure

SAMPLE FORMAT FOR REVISED AMENDMENT PRACTICE

(Rev. 6/03)

Appl. No. : XX/YYYY,YYY Confirmation No. WXYZ
Applicant : James Q. Inventor
Filed : April 19, 2003
TC/A.U. : 1744
Examiner : John Doe
Docket No. : 12345/JAS/R758
Customer No. : 88888

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

Sir:

In response to the Office action of October 16, 2003, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Specification begin on page 2 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 3 of this paper.

Amendments to the Drawings begin on page 4 of this paper and include both an attached replacement sheet and an annotated sheet showing changes.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 5 of this paper.

An **Appendix** including amended drawing figures is attached following page 5 of this paper.

Amendments to the Specification:

Please replace paragraph [0021] with the following amended paragraph:

[0021] In the construction of the bucket of this invention, various materials have been selected ~~[[and]]~~ which offer a number of diverse properties ~~[[,]]~~ and allow for varied functions of the article. For caustic solutions, the bucket can be made of a durable ~~polymer~~ plastic material. Where an aesthetic appeal is desired, the bucket can be any ~~[[of]]~~ one of many attractive colors. The following ~~listing~~ list of properties serves to define possible uses for the buckets.

Please replace paragraph [0045] with the following amended paragraph:

[0045] Figure 1 displays a bucket of the invention. As can be seen from the drawing, ~~the a~~ handle is attached to the upper lip of the structure and connected at points diametrically opposite each other on the circumference.

Please add the following new paragraph after paragraph [0075]:

[0075.1] An optional feature of the articles of the invention is the addition of a tetrafluoroethylene coating to the bucket to provide protection from any contents which might be caustic. The coating can be provided to the surface during the manufacturing process or can be added in a later step.

Please delete the paragraph beginning at page 2, line 4, which starts with "Under normal circumstances"

Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

Claims 1-5 (canceled)

Claim 6 (previously presented): A bucket with a handle.

Claim 7 (withdrawn): A handle comprising an elongated wire.

Claim 8 (withdrawn): The handle of claim 7 further comprising a plastic grip.

Claim 9 (currently amended): A bucket with a ~~green~~ blue handle.

Claim 10 (original): The bucket of claim 9 wherein the handle is made of wood.

Claim 11 (canceled)

Claim 12 (not entered)

Claim 13 (new): A bucket with plastic sides and bottom.

Appl. No. XX/YYY,YYY
Amdt. dated Jan. 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of Oct. 16, 2003

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1-2, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1-2. In Figure 2, previously omitted element 13 has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the specification, the paragraphs [0021] and [0045] have been amended to correct minor editorial problems. The new paragraph [0075.1] added after paragraph [0075] discusses in general terms the features taken from Example 4.

In amended Figure 2, the previously omitted element numeral 13 has been added.

Claims 6-10 and 12-13 remain in this application. Claims 1-5 and 11 have been canceled. Claims 7 and 8 have been withdrawn.

The examiner has acknowledged that claims 6 and 9-10 are directed to allowable subject matter. Claim 7-8 have been withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Claim 13 adds an additional feature from Example 2 in the specification.

In view of the examiner's earlier restriction requirement, applicant retains the right to present claims 7-8 in a divisional application

.....
.....

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, JONES & BROWN

By _____
Martin J. Gallagher
Reg. No. 99,999
Tel.: (101) 555-2345

Attachments



